DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 014 24 EA 004 262

AUTHOR	Farquhar, Robin H.; Piele, Philip K.
TITLE	Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation. ERIC/CEM/ State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Fourteen. UCEA Monograph Series, Number One.
INSTITUTION	Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.; University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0353
PUB DATE	72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	71p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. ($2.00, Quantity Discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Administrator Selection; Continuous Learning; *Educational Administration; Graduation Requirements; Inservice Education; Instructional Design; *Literature Reviews; Management Education; Personnel Selection; *Professional Training; *Program Content; Program Design; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Student Research; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, the authors provide a general overview of recent literature on administrator preparation programs. Ten chapters parallel the major interrelated components of an administrator preparation program: Program content, program structure, recruitment and selection, instructional approaches, field-related experiences, student research, graduation requirements, program evaluation and development, departmental functions and staffing, and inservice programs. The survey is limited largely to recently published books and journals that treat as their prime topic the preparation of administrators in education. An extensive bibliography is included. (Author/DN)

ED 069014

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature

Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele

EA 004 262

1972

Commissioned by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
University Council for
Educational Administration

ERIC/CEM–UCEA SERIES ON ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION

Under the editorship of

PHILIP K. PIELE, Director

ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
University of Oregon

and

JACK CULBERTSON, Executive Director

University Council
for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management operates under contract with the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This publication was prepared pursuant to that contract. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 72-86746
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 004 262

ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Fourteen
UCEA Monograph Series, Number One

Manuscript edited by Stuart C. Smith

Printed in the United States of America
Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
19 North Jackson
Danville, Illinois 61832

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

1. **Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature,** by Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele

2. **Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators,** by Richard Wynn

3. **Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators,** by Frank W. Lutz and Reynolds Ferrante

4. **Training-in-Common for Educational, Business, and Public Administrators,** by Erwin Miklos

5. **New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators,** by Robert T. Stout

6. **The Preparation of School Administrators in Quantitative Analysis,** by James E. Bruno

7. **The Use of Computers in Administrator Preparation,** by E. Wailand Bessent and Philip K. Piele

8. **Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Administrators,** by Peter P. Horoschak and Joseph M. Cronin

Copies, at $2.00 each, can be purchased from the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Quantity discounts as follows: 2 to 24 copies, $1.80 each; 25 or more copies, $1.60 each.

ERIC/CEM

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the United States Office of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of eighteen such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its seventeen companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $21 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Leasco Information Products, Inc.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $39 a year from CCM Information Corporation, 866 Third Avenue, Room 1126, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its area.

UCEA

The mission of the University Council for Educational Administration is to improve the preparation of administrative personnel in education. Its membership consists of major universities in the United States and Canada. UCEA's central staff works with and through scholars in member universities to create new standards and practices in administrator preparation and to disseminate the results to interested institutions.

UCEA's interest in the professional preparation of educational administrators includes both continuing education and resident, preservice programs. Interinstitutional cooperation and communication are basic tools used in development activities; both administrators and professors participate in projects.

The Council's efforts currently are divided into six areas: developing and testing strategies for improving administrative and leadership practices in school systems; encouraging an effective flow of leaders into preparatory programs and posts of educational administration; advancing research and its dissemination; providing information and ideas helpful to those in universities responsible for designing preparatory programs; integrating and improving preparatory programs in specific areas of administration; and developing and evaluating the Monroe City URBSIM simulation and support materials.

Contents

FOREWORD vii

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. PROGRAM CONTENT 4
   - Practice-Based Content 5
   - Discipline-Based Content 7
   - Evaluation of Content 14

3. PROGRAM STRUCTURE 16
   - Internal Organization 16
   - External Organization 18

4. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION 20
   - Recruitment 20
   - Selection 25

5. INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES 28

6. FIELD-RELATED EXPERIENCES 30

7. STUDENT RESEARCH 35

8. GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS 38
   - Internships 39
   - Residencies 39

9. PROGRAM EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT 41

10. DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS AND STAFFING 44

11. CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS 49
   - Assessments of Present Offerings 49
   - Projections of New Approaches 51

12. CONCLUSION 55

BIBLIOGRAPHY 57

Foreword

During the last decade, programs to prepare educational administrators have undergone considerable change. Growing specialization in the field of educational administration resulting from new knowledge production (for example, operations research) is one reason for the program change. Another is the continuing search for more effective patterns of field experience, instructional method, and content in preparatory programs.

Because of the varied changes achieved in preparation in different universities, those interested in designing or updating programs today are faced with a greater number of options than was the case ten years ago. A major purpose of this monograph series is to shed light on the various options now available to those interested in administrator preparation. A second purpose is to advance general understanding of developments in preparation during the past decade. The series is directed to professors, students, and administrators interested in acquiring information on various aspects of preparation.

Each author in the series has been asked to define the parameters of his subject, review and analyze recent pertinent literature and research, describe promising new practices emerging in actual training programs across the country, and identify knowledge gaps and project future developments. The papers in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management and the University Council for Educational Administration. The editors of the series hope that the monographs will prove valuable to those interested in understanding and assessing recent and projected developments in preparation.

In this monograph, which serves as the introduction to the series, Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele provide a general overview of recent literature on administrator preparation programs. By surveying written knowledge on all the major components of preparation programs, they establish a base line on which authors of subsequent monographs in the series can build.

Dr. Farquhar is an associate professor and chairman of the Department of Educational Administration at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. He is also an associate professor in the Graduate Department of Educational Theory at the University of Toronto. He holds bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of British Columbia (1960 and 1964) and a doctor's degree from the University of Chicago (1967).

From 1966 to 1971 Dr. Farquhar served on the staff of the University Council for Educational Administration, first as associate director and then as deputy director. He is the author of numerous professional papers, monographs, and journal articles dealing with preparation of educational administrators.

Dr. Piele is an associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration and director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management at the University of Oregon.

PHILIP K. PIELE
JACK CULBERTSON

1

Introduction

As the introduction to the series, this monograph differs in purpose and scope from those that follow. Each subsequent monograph focuses on one aspect of administrator preparation, with the purpose of reviewing and analyzing relevant literature and describing and evaluating current practices that may or may not be reported in the literature.

In this monograph our task is to survey the general components of administrator preparation, most of which are covered more thoroughly by authors of the other monographs. Unlike the other authors, we do not describe and analyze recent trends, assess current needs, or predict emergent practices. Our description of the components of administrator preparation is limited to what the literature says about them. There are many new developments in preparation programs that are not reported here; a primary purpose of the remaining monographs in this series is to fill these gaps.

Much has been written that relates directly or indirectly to leadership development in education. To make the task of reviewing

recent literature on preparation programs manageable, we have imposed several restrictions on the material to be included here.

First, the documents surveyed are limited largely to published books and journals. The exceptions are a few papers prepared in connection with certain activities of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), some unpublished materials provided by several universities in response to a request sent to all UCEA member institutions for reports evaluating their preparatory programs, and documents processed by ERIC and announced in its monthly catalog, *Research in Education.*

Second, we have surveyed only those works that explicitly treat administrator preparation in education as their primary topic. This restriction eliminates writings that deal with preparation only implicitly and textbooks that present preparation as a purpose rather than as a topic.

Third, the material reviewed is limited, where the restriction is applicable, to writings on the preservice and inservice preparation of public school superintendents at the doctoral and postdoctoral level.

Finally, with few "landmark" exceptions, we have included only material written between 1963 and 1972.

Even within these restrictions, this review is not exhaustive. Undoubtedly other relevant publications could have been included. Nevertheless, a fairly generous selection is surveyed to give the flavor of recent literature on administrator preparation.

In selecting the components of an administrator preparation program to consider here, we have relied on an analytical framework developed by Culbertson and others (1969). They conceptualized a preparation program as composed of ten interrelated components, defined generally as follows:

1. Program Content—the knowledge to which the preservice program exposes prospective superintendents
2. Program Structure—the organization (for example, core, sequence, duration) of the various elements (mandatory and optional) that constitute the preservice program
3. Recruitment and Selection—the identification of potential candidates for the preservice program and the bases including previous education and experience requirements) on which actual enrollees are chosen from this pool

4. Instructional Approaches—the methods (for example, seminars, laboratories) and materials (for example, case studies, simulations) through which content is presented in the preservice program
5. Field-Related Experiences—the kinds of contacts, if any, that enrollees in the preservice program are required or encouraged to have with administrative practice "on the firing line" (for example, internships, participation in surveys)
6. Student Research—the nature of problems selected for dissertation study, the investigative approaches employed (for example, empirical, experimental, statistical, historical, biographical, philosophical), and the integration (if any) with other research projects
7. Requirements for Graduation—the aspects of the preservice program requisite to completion of the doctorate (for example, residence period, foreign language, minimum semester hours, research or development projects, field-related experiences, required courses
8. Program Evaluation and Development—the means (that is, techniques, frequency) by which attempts are made to determine the success of the preservice program in preparing "good" superintendents and to revise the program on the basis of such assessments
9. Departmental Functions and Staffing—the various specialties (in terms of competencies possessed and tasks performed) represented by the professors in the department of educational administration who participate in the preservice preparation of superintendents
10. Inservice Programs—the nature (that is, content, methods, duration, participants, frequency) of continuing education experiences offered by the university for practicing superintendents

An eleventh, program purpose, might have been added. Although this component is probably the most basic of all training dimensions, we have ignored it in this review for two main reasons: (1) it is highly idiosyncratic to individual universities, professors, and students; and (2) perhaps for this reason, it is a topic that has been virtually ignored in the literature.

Each of the ten components is discussed in one of the following chapters.

2

Program Content

Of the ten preparation program components under consideration, program content is discussed most frequently in the literature. Numerous individuals and organizations have sought to identify the chief substantive elements of "comprehensive," "basic," or "essential" preparation for the superintendency, and every university purporting to train school superintendents has had to resolve these elements to its own satisfaction.

As Gregg has noted, "there is no general agreement among institutions on a specific set of courses which should comprise a particular type of program" (1969, p. 20). Nevertheless, it is possible to generalize about the status quo and about the apparent trends and needs in superintendent preparation content reflected in the literature.

The literature on program content is surveyed in three topical categories: skills required by superintendents in dealing with in-practice problems, disciplinary bases of the preparation curriculum, and evaluation of current program content.

PRACTICE-BASED CONTENT

A limited amount of recent literature on superintendent preparation is devoted to the topic of skills needed by the chief school officer. The New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership reported, on the basis of its 1966 questionnaire survey of 565 superintendents in the state, that "evaluations of specific courses consistently revealed a high value on human relations courses. Technical skills such as school finance and law were rated second highest in importance. Conceptual skills reflected in courses dealing with curriculum theory and philosophy of education followed in third place" (1967, p. 30). Goldhammer and his colleagues, in interviewing forty-seven superintendents representing twenty-two states, found that "about half of those criticizing shortages in their preparation wanted more emphasis upon conceptualization. . . . [while] another group felt shortchanged in some of the technical skills," calling particularly for "more emphasis on personnel and organizational management skills" (1967, p. 111).

More specifically, the skill of conflict management receives explicit attention in the literature. Corwin notes that "if conflict is a routine and normal occurrence within the administrative process, then administrative training programs should address themselves systematically to the proper role of conflict—its positive as well as negative functions" (1965, p. 18). Cunningham and Nystrand (1969) refer to the need to develop skills that will enable the prospective urban school administrator to "beat the system" and to change it.

Another skill receiving particular attention is the use of modern technology in decision-making. Ramseyer advises:

> The training and preparation of school administrators should make the student knowledgeable about the availability of new tools and techniques to assist him in coping with the complex problems of tomorrow's schools. This should include not only a general understanding of the electronic instruments but also of systems approaches to problem solving and task accomplishment. (1966, p. 135)

Three years later, however, Gregg observed that despite the availability to education of sophisticated data-processing mechanisms, "only a minority of school administrators understand their nature and capabilities and a still smaller proportion know how to make use of them" (1969, p. 8).

In the recent literature on program content, analysis of the administrator's in-practice problems receives about the same attention as do required skills. Goldhammer and others (1967) found that most problems identified by superintendents can be grouped into six main categories, according to interrelationships perceived by interviewees.

The first category, "educational change," includes problems related to the pressure for educational innovation that results from shifting community expectations for the schools, interventions by agencies external to the school system, and pressures from within the organization itself.

The second category, "teacher militancy," comprises problems posed for the superintendent by the demands of teacher groups for a role in the educational decision-making process. Scott (1966) dealt at some length with administrator training needs created in this problem area.

The third category, identified by Goldhammer and his colleagues as "instruction," relates to issues of curriculum, instructional services, evaluation, adaptation, and learning outcomes.

Demands placed on the superintendent's competency by new leadership functions emerging both within the school organization and in relation to the broader community constitute the fourth category of concerns, referred to by the authors as "administrative leadership."

The fifth problem area, "finance," encompasses all the traditional problems faced by the superintendent as resource manager for the school district.

The final category of problems cited by the superintendents interviewed is "critical social issues." These problems are related primarily to the administration of schools in urban settings, an area that, according to Gregg (1969), has not been given sufficient attention in preparation programs. Predominant among these critical issues are those "of church and state, of desegregation, of the more equitable distribution of economic resources, [and] of the reduction of social distance among cultural and racial groups" (Goldhammer and others, 1967, p. 11).

Although the literature contains no evidence of a generally accepted program for preparing superintendents to deal with social problems, and although most evidence indicates that current

training programs are inadequate in this regard,* one argument advanced by several writers deserves to be noted. It is their view that, to better understand the social issues and cultural problems of America, prospective educational administrators should be exposed to information on educational conditions in other countries. This argument was put forth by Lecht (1966) in a general discussion of leadership development for the seventies and by Engleman (1963) in describing the elements common to principal and superintendent preparation programs. Similarly, one of the five main elements in Reller's proposed program for administrator preparation is "area study," in which "provision would be made for each student to develop knowledge and understanding of . . . one (or more) of the newly developing countries" (1962, p. 115).

The foregoing notwithstanding, there is no plethora of recent literature relating specifically to trends and needs in superintendent preparation program content derived from practice-oriented skills and problems. One reason for a content lacking in practical skills and problems is the tendency for such "reality-oriented" matters to be subsumed within components other than program content in the total preparatory process—particularly instructional approaches and field-related experiences (and, to a lesser extent, inservice programs). A related reason is that in the last decade discipline-based content has begun to displace practice-based content in administrator preparation programs.

DISCIPLINE-BASED CONTENT

In a dissertation for the University of Colorado, Beckner assessed the effectiveness of university programs for preparing superintendents in a particular region of the country. Beckner based his assessment on criteria identified by a jury of nationally recognized leaders in administrator preparation. In compiling these criteria, he found:

> The jury members considered study outside the field of education essential to a superintendent preparation program. From fifteen to twenty-five semester hours of study in cognate, inter-disciplinary study was recommended, depending on the individual situation. The cognate fields of study considered most appropriate to a

*See, for example, Francis Keppel, *The Necessary Revolution in American Education* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 152.

> superintendent preparation program were the social sciences, humanities and behavioral sciences. (1966, p. 146)

There is little question that this criterion reflects the dominant trend in program content in the last decade. The literature pertaining to the incorporation of discipline-based content into preparatory programs is reviewed below with reference, first, to the social and behavioral sciences and, second, to the humanities.

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Six years ago, Tope and others observed "a growing interest in the contributions of the social sciences to educational administration" and noted an "intriguing analogy" between these contributions and those of the biological sciences to medicine (1965, p. iii). The analogy may be weak, but interest in application of the social sciences to the preparation of educational administrators appears to be strong.

In its two-year study of superintendent preparation, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) found that "the disciplines of sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, business or public administration, and psychology have been mentioned with considerable frequency as making definite contributions to the preparation of school administrators" (1964, p. 45). The integration of content from these fields, particularly in courses on administrative theory and research methodology, was identified by the AASA study as a "quite obvious" shift in program content since the late fifties.

More recently, Goldhammer and others (1967) found that, of the preparatory programs his team surveyed, approximately two-thirds required cognate work in the behavioral sciences, with the number of term hours necessary varying from three to thirty, but with a mode of twelve to fifteen. Cunningham and others (1963) also note this development.*

The development is by no means universal, however. Miklos observes:

> On the basis of superficial evidence one could conclude that there are considerable variations in the extent to which behavioral science content is found to be part of the study of educational administration in various centers. It might also be observed that there is further

*See also AASA, *The American School Superintendent* (Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1971).

> variation in the means by which social scientific content is injected or incorporated into the programs. (1969, p. 103)

One plausible explanation for this variability is Goldhammer and others' finding of "a scarcity of consistent programs with well-developed rationales for the use of behavioral sciences in preparing administrators for the achievement of specified goals" (1967, p. 114).

A related reason is the failure to answer satisfactorily three questions asked by Cunningham, Downey, and Goldhammer concerning the inclusion of social science content in administrator preparation programs:

> Why incorporate the social sciences into preparation programs for school administrators? What social science content is relevant to educational administration? And how can universities organize and draw upon their resources in such a way as to realize maximum effectiveness in the so-called interdisciplinary approach to the preparation of school administrators? (1963, pp. 97-98)

Miklos suggests that incorporating such content in administrator preparation programs "may be seen (1) as liberalizing, (2) as supplementary, or (3) as basic" (1969, p. 3).

More specifically, Goldhammer identifies four values that the social sciences have for the school administrator:

1. The social sciences help the educational administrator achieve both a method for the collection of data and a systematic way of looking at things.
2. The social sciences can help the educational administrator acquire broad knowledge of the setting in which education and the functions of administration take place.
3. Through the social sciences the educational administrator can gain added understanding of the significance of the phenomena with which he deals.
4. The social sciences can help improve the basis which the educational administrator has for predicting the consequences of his actions and decisions. (1963, pp. 14-19)

Another related viewpoint receiving some support in the literature*

*See, for example, Francis Keppel, *Public Policy in School Administration*, the first Alfred D. Simpson lecture on administration (Cambridge, Mass.: The New England School Development Council, 1961), pp. 17-18; and Charles E. Brown, "Educating Administrators for Education," a Ford Foundation reprint, 1968, p. 3.

is that school administration is closely linked to public administration and thus should draw heavily on the same disciplinary content for its preparation programs. Content from economics, political science, and sociology is considered especially useful in illuminating the major contemporary issues confronting public policy makers. According to Farquhar (1969), recent evidence suggests that superintendents are being exposed to a growing amount of content from business and public administration.

The AASA study of 1962-63 identified four major ways in which prospective superintendents are exposed to content in the social and behavioral sciences:

> (a) courses in the disciplines are required; (b) professors of these disciplines teach certain courses designed especially for school administrators, often in the college of education; (c) professors of educational administration learn from their colleagues in these disciplines that content and those concepts that apply to school administration, and introduce them in their own courses; (d) professors of educational administration and professors of other disciplines teach courses jointly. (1964, p. 19)

Although there appears to be no agreement yet on the effectiveness of these approaches, Anderson and Lonsdale observed that "it seems better to have the experts from other fields apply their background to the problems of educational administration than to have students in educational administration attempt to gain from systematic material oriented to other fields those facts and insights which have special applicability to administrative problems in education" (1957, p. 445).

The Anderson-Lonsdale argument raises the question of relevance, one of several problems faced by those seeking to use social and behavioral science content in preparing superintendents. Tope and others suggest that two major problems are involving the social scientist and selecting the content to be included. The involvement of the social scientist is discussed in the next chapter. Regarding the selection of content, the authors conclude that "it will probably never be satisfactorily determined which material gleaned from social science study and research is more relevant to a field like school administration. A great deal will depend on particular social sciences and particular school administrators" (1965, p. 27).

In 1963, Cunningham, Downey, and Goldhammer identified the dilemma confronting those struggling with the problem of content relevance: "whether to begin with the substances of the various

social sciences and attempt to extract from these such materials as appear to be of most use to the administrator, or to begin with a specification of the substance of administration and attempt to identify the areas in which this overlaps with the substance of the various social sciences" (p. 97).

Several years later Goldhammer and colleagues found, however, that professors of educational administration frequently reported that their students were smart enough to draw the implications for practice from theory; "but superintendents reported that some of their problems arose from a poor conceptual base which they found difficult, if not impossible, to translate to their immediate problems" (1967, pp. 145-155). Elsewhere Goldhammer offers the explanation "that we have been guilty of erroneously thinking that we could apply the social sciences globally to educational administration rather than to the components of tasks, problems, and processes which comprise the content of administrative actions and behaviors" (1968, p. 175). In a related vein, Cunningham and Nystrand criticize the adoption, by several universities in recent years, of "a cult of social science for its own sake" (1969, p. 17).

In a forthcoming volume written under the auspices of UCEA, Culbertson and others (1972) delineate and illustrate four ways of viewing the relevance of social science content to administrator preparation:

1. the discipline-based perspective, which starts with and assesses relevance by reference to concepts, research findings, generalizations, and modes of inquiry in social science disciplines
2. the theory-based perspective, which starts with and assesses relevance by reference to theories of administration and organization associated with the "science" of administration
3. the problem-based perspective, which starts with and assesses relevance by reference to problems confronting or likely to confront educational administrators
4. the career-based perspective, which starts with and assesses relevance by reference to career objectives and functions of personnel preparing to use knowledge in educational administration within different settings and for different purposes

From an examination of the application of these perspectives in

actual preparatory programs, Farquhar concludes that, while they do not fully resolve the problem of relevance, "to a greater extent than previous approaches, they provide the professor conceptual frameworks which enable him to examine and clarify his instructional objectives, and they have potential for generating explicit criteria according to which he can determine the relevance of social science content to his instructional objectives" (Culbertson and others 1972, p. 17).

In addition to the issue of relevance, Cunningham, Downey, and Goldhammer note four other problems to be dealt with in drawing on the social sciences for administrator preparation: (1) superficiality and narrowness, (2) trained incapacitation, (3) cost, and (4) danger of overdependence on the social sciences. This last point introduces consideration of the role of content from the humanities in the preparation of school administrators.

HUMANITIES

Many of the problems encountered in attempts to "borrow" content from the social and behavioral sciences also occur in efforts to use humanities material, though the latter has not achieved the same degree of acceptance during the past decade. A major reason for this limited acceptance is that the relevance of humanities content to educational administration is more difficult to establish than is the relevance of the social sciences.

Nevertheless, there are some indications in the recent literature that the humanities offer potential for improved preparation of educational administrators. For example, Farquhar (1970) has identified three rather distinct arguments that support this view.

One rationale—the "general liberalization" approach—is based on the belief that to develop the special intellectual, personal, social, and ethical qualities essential to effective leadership, the prospective administrator must be exposed to the best classical and contemporary expressions of man's relationships to his fellow man and to the world of ideas, feelings, and matter around him. According to this argument, such expressions are typically found in the great works of literature, philosophy, and the arts. This view is supported by Goldhammer (1963), Walton (1962), New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership (1967), and Achilles (1970), among others.

Typical of the vagueness surrounding this rationale is the following statement published by AASA:

> The superintendent of schools who would become sensitive to the forces that hold society together or that threaten to rip it apart, who would have a sympathetic understanding of the uneasiness and anxieties that hang like shadows over people in times of stress and strain, who would get a feeling of the order and unity of the total culture—indeed of all mankind and the whole universe—can do no better than turn to literature, music, art, and philosophy. (1963b, p. 23)

In fairness, it must be noted that the vagueness in this comment is somewhat mitigated by the fact that the authors go on to illustrate the application of particular content from each of these disciplines to administrator preparation.

Another, more precise, rationale supporting use of humanities content is as follows: since purpose is a chief distinguishing feature among organizations, since the determination and realization of organizational purpose requires the administrator's skill in making value judgments, and since this skill can be developed through exposure to content depicting value conflicts and moral dilemmas, the prospective administrator should study the humanities, where such content abounds. Among the more forceful proponents of this view are Harlow (1962), Culbertson (1964), and Achilles (1970). For example, Culbertson suggests that content from literary sources "be used to assist potential administrators (a) to think clearly about persistent moral issues faced by those in organizations, (b) to analyze the contradictory forces that are generated by competing value systems, and (c) to assess possible consequences of being guided by one set of values as opposed to another" (1964, pp. 318-322).

The third rationale for using humanities content is that since creativity is essential to effective educational leadership, the prospective school administrator may benefit from exposure to "pure" expressions of the creative process, particularly the arts. In this view the effective administrator is, at least in part, an artist, in that he must fashion order and direction from among a myriad of interrelated variables. Support for this rationale is almost nonexistent in the recent literature on administrator preparation, though Ohm and Monahan (1965) have recognized its tenability and Cheal (1967) has applied some basic principles of creativity to the "art"

of school administration.

Farquhar (1970) provides the most comprehensive review of literature on the use of the humanities in training educational administrators. He considers such literature "limited almost entirely to some pleas and arguments in favor of such use, and to the identification of a few problems and issues that might be anticipated in its implementation" (1970, p. 41). Finding little published knowledge in the literature, Farquhar sought to analyze operating programs that use the humanities to prepare educational administrators. After examining five exemplary programs at the universities of Minnesota, Florida, Miami, Rochester, and Tennessee, Farquhar concludes:

1. Such programs are more typically designed for preservice than for inservice purposes.
2. They draw most typically upon literature (including novels, plays, essays, and poems), less commonly upon philosophy, infrequently upon history and painting, and very seldom upon music, sculpture, dancing, or other arts.
3. They are most typically structured to introduce the humanities as a distinct component of the total preparation program.
4. The instructional medium they most typically use is the high-involvement seminar, with some use of audiovisual and role-playing mechanisms, but with primary reliance on written materials.
5. They are usually staffed so that major responsibility for the program is held by an educational administration professor, but with extensive support provided by resource persons from the humanities.
6. They most typically consult student opinion as the source of evaluation. (p. 42)

Evaluation of Content

The literature contains very little evidence of any attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of various program contents in preparing school superintendents. There are at least two possible reasons: (1) such evaluations have not been conducted, a possibility explored later in chapter 9; and (2) evaluations have been conducted but their results have not been reported. Should the latter be the case, those conducting the evaluations have neglected the important responsibility of making their research known.

A few general assessments of program content are recorded. With regard to practice-based content, the superintendents participating in the 1967 study by Goldhammer and others felt that their pre-

paratory programs "were far from adequate for preparing them to resolve the problems which daily confront them." Some of them believed the program content was obsolete, which may be explained in part by the fact that "no university admitted to any systematic means of identifying problems and issues faced by superintendents" (1967, p. 108). The lack of relevance of preparation programs, particularly for urban school administrators, also was noted by Cunningham and Nystrand (1969). Nagle asserts there is a "paucity of research evidence that can be called upon to support the inclusion or exclusion of various aspects of a preparation program" (1969, p. 26).

Published assessments of discipline-based content are no more encouraging. As previously indicated, humanities content has not yet been sufficiently incorporated into administrator preparation programs to warrant a comprehensive evaluation. Boyan offers this assessment of content from the social and behavioral sciences:

> Certainly there is evidence of more use of behavioral and social science concepts and research findings in educational administration courses and workshops. However, there is preciously little evidence available about the impact on practice of the increased turn of educational administration to the social and behavioral sciences over the last 15 years. (1968, p. 34)

Gregg (1969) reports that even the little progress made in this direction has been slow, and Miklos concludes that "the interdisciplinary emphasis is more imagined than real" (1969, p. 2).

As possible reasons for the lack of interdisciplinary emphasis, Miklos suggests that those preparing administrators may have (1) underestimated the magnitude of the task, (2) underestimated the complexity of the task, (3) overemphasized the necessity of bringing prospective administrators into direct contact with social scientists, (4) underemphasized the significance of the professor of educational administration, (5) failed to learn how to work with social scientists, (6) been too cautious in approaching the task, and (7) been far too unstructured in the development of programs.

The majority of these postulated reasons for inadequacies of content result from difficulties encountered in the structure of preparatory programs, which is the subject of the next chapter.

3

Program Structure

The structural component of preparatory programs has received less attention in the literature than program content. What little writing there is on program structure is reviewed here in two general categories: internal organization and external organization.

Internal Organization

Boyan assessed the typical curricular structure of preparatory programs for educational administrators as follows: "Curriculum development in educational administration today looks very much like the conventional local school system approach. It is disparate, fragmented, uneven, scattered, and mainly non-cumulative" (1968, p. 34). While clearly there are exceptions to this generalization, it represents a fair description of the incremental manner in which preparation programs have commonly evolved, and it indicates the lack of a Gestalt conception of the total preparatory experience that characterizes many programs.

The literature contains suggestions for overcoming this dysfunctional structural incrementalism, but there is little evidence these suggestions have been followed. Culbertson and Farquhar, for example, have written of the need for differentiated training programs for professors and practitioners: "The attainment of differentiated preparation for those pursuing differing career patterns in educational administration should help professors and students cope more effectively with issues related to both program structure and program flexibility" (1971a, p. 11).

Harlow proposes a "division of the graduate work of the prospective administrator into three components of approximately equal size: (1) empirical social sciences, (2) humanities, and (3) technical management skills, culminating in the doctor's degree" (1962, p. 70). In arguing for the preparation of the administrator as "the clinical student of organization or the clinical student of society," Goldhammer offers the following proposition for program structure:

> The components of the needed administrative preparatory program today include: knowledge-building experiences, skill-building experiences, diagnostic experiences, experiences in the application of knowledge and data to concrete situations, experiences in the interpretation of knowledge and its "reduction" for the specific application to discrete problems and communities. (1968, p. 181)

Nagle, after reviewing the current status of preparation programs, concludes:

> . . . given the current status of administrative and learning theory, preparation programs for school administrators can be most successful if varied in approach, flexible in structure, free from institutional dysfunctions, and attendant to the tasks and responsibilities of an administrator in both his immediate organization and the larger society of which that organization is an integral part. (1969, p. 26)

He then sets forth ten principles on which to build future preparation programs.

Thus, there are concern and debate not only about the desirable balance among the various elements needed in administrator preparation, but also about what these elements should be.

Probably the chief continuing dilemma encountered in the internal organization of preparatory programs is the flexibility-versus-rigidity issue. At one end of this continuum is the flexible approach recommended above by Nagle. At the other end is the more highly structured approach proposed by Reller:

> The program (for preparing superintendents) should be sharply separated from the general university program of graduate studies which has other purposes primarily in view. This does not mean that it should not utilize regular university offerings (in education or other fields for which the student is preparing) but, rather, that it should have a core designed specifically in light of its own purposes. It should be an entity and have a life of its own within the university community. (1962, p. 111)

As one would expect, the reality of preparation programs generally falls somewhere between these two extremes. Indeed, the current trend appears to be toward achieving balance between the two by approaching both. Thus, there seems to be an inclination both toward core blocks or sequential arrangements and toward "individualization of learning activities and of student initiative in the planning and operationalizing of learning behaviors" (Rose 1971, p. 18).

External Organization

The interdisciplinary trend in program content and the variety of approaches for achieving it were discussed in the preceding chapter. Several problems confront those who seek to structure such experiences for prospective superintendents. Some of these problems are logical, in that joint appointments, scheduling conflicts, prerequisites, and determination of relevance seem to provide special difficulties. Others are psychological in nature. Some social scientists, for example, seem to preceive a loss of prestige or a sacrifice of scholarly interests and associations in participating formally in the preparation of education administrators. In structuring an effective interdisciplinary program, it is essential that cordial and functional working relationships and mutual respect be established between professors of educational administration and those in the related disciplines. Goldhammer and colleagues provide some insights on this topic:

> Relationships with the behavioral science divisions vary. Most professors of educational administration reported an excellent relationship. Their meaning of "excellent" ranged from being able to arrange for education students to take behavioral science offerings without the necessary prerequisites to having behavioral science faculty members participate in program development activities for educational administrators. A few universities indicated they have behavioral scientists who are interested in the field of educational

> administration on the faculty of the division of educational administration. (1967, p. 107)

With the exception of these few universities, interdisciplinary arrangements still leave much to be desired; however, some progress is being made.

Another significant concern related to external organization is the growing acceptance of the "administration qua administration" view, and the resultant trend toward the emergence of a new structure for preparing administrators "through the creation of graduate schools of administration, in which a substantial proportion of the preparation program is experienced in common by prospective business, educational, and public administrators" (Farquhar 1969, p. 11). Snyder has outlined two basic assumptions on which this development is based:

> First, there are significant common phenomena and problems which cut across the institutional-organizational realms. . . . Obviously, there are important differences but these have tended to be overemphasized at the expense of equally significant similarities. Second, it is assumed that in view of relatively recent developments in the contributing disciplines, the time is right to construct an integrated course of advanced study which would serve as fundamental preparation for a variety of future careers in a variety of institutional settings. (1969, p. 2)

Professors of educational administration express support for this view. It seems likely an independent organizational structure existing solely for the preparation of administrators will be tested in a variety of forms during the next decade.

4

Recruitment and Selection

As used here, *recruitment* is the process by which possible candidates for administrator preparation programs are identified and persuaded to consider entering the programs. *Selection* is the procedure for assessing the potential enrollees according to certain criteria and for admitting to the programs those possessing the desired characteristics. Since selection depends largely on recruitment, selection results should be "fed back" to inform subsequent recruitment efforts. For analytical purposes, these two processes for attracting and admitting desirable candidates are discussed separately in this chapter.

RECRUITMENT

Probably the most definitive work to date on recruitment of candidates for advanced administrative preparation programs is the position paper published by UCEA in 1966, *The Selective Recruitment of Educational Leaders.* This document summarizes the various positions taken by UCEA member universities on recruitment:

1. The need for organized recruitment of talented candidates for school leadership posts is both urgent and great.
2. No matter how great the quantitative need, the major focus in recruitment endeavors should be on quality and on attracting some of society's most talented individuals into leadership positions; procedures for identifying these individuals must be sharpened.
3. All means of communication must be exploited to reach competent people and the attainment of increased financial support for their preparation deserves the highest priority.
4. The task is so large and the challenge so great that only a systematically planned attack on the problem provides any hope for meeting the need. (1966c, p. 20)

The document also discusses a number of problems associated with recruitment and makes a few suggestions for their solution.

Drawing from an extensive study* of administrator preparation programs, Culbertson and Farquhar, in the October 1970 *UCEA Newsletter* discuss findings that pertain specifically to recruitment and selection. They describe three major recruitment changes reported by UCEA universities during the period 1963-1968: (1) expansion of the talent pool to include younger candidates, minority group members (especially blacks), and students "from undergraduate and master's programs (particularly in the social sciences)"; (2) greater effort to recruit candidates with prior teaching and administrative experience; and (3) "more aggressive and systematic approaches to the identification of potential candidates" (1970, p. 10).

LIMITATIONS AND OBSTACLES

The literature identifies numerous limitations and obstacles that hinder recruitment in educational administration. One is that the talent pool for administrator recruitment is typically restricted to persons already in education. This limitation derives from the traditional belief that teaching experience is a prerequisite for effective school administration. Increasingly, the validity of this belief is being questioned. Talbot, referring to the big-city context, states

*Jack Culbertson and others, *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies. Final Report.* (1969)

that "training in teachers' colleges and experience as a teacher, principal, or suburban school superintendent are largely irrelevant for the staggering problems of running an urban school system" (1966, p. 81). Meade (1967) reaches a similar conclusion. There is, in fact, no convincing evidence that experience in teaching is related to success in educational administration. Both Brown (1968) and Goldhammer and colleagues (1967) call for a thorough reexamination of this axiom. This line of thought also raises some questions about the validity of such traditional restrictions to entry into the profession as state certification requirements. Recent legislation in Oregon, Washington, and California has eliminated teaching as a prerequisite for administrative certification.

Another limitation educational administration faces in competing for scarce leadership talent is the haphazard manner in which recruitment is typically conducted. The 1953 study of recruitment and selection, undertaken through the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (Middle Atlantic Region), produced the following findings:

1. No planned or organized program of recruitment of able talent to prepare for school administration as a career is being conducted by member institutions in the Middle Atlantic Region.
2. Institutions depend to a great extent upon incidental and casual contacts made through catalogs, extension work, conferences, study councils, institutes, and seminars. (Neagley 1953, p. 32)

During the past two decades, little has been done to create new recruitment patterns surmounting these shortcomings. In 1966 Griffiths observed that "recruitment of students to enter graduate schools of education in order to prepare themselves to be superintendents of schools is practically non-existent. Practically all of the universities choose from among those who 'knock on the door'. Almost all superintendents are 'self-recruited'" (1966, p. 49).

Several obstacles that may account for, or result from, the above limitations are also recognized. One is the lack of available information about school administration as a career and as a field of study. Baughman observes that "a dearth of information about school administration as a career exists in the secondary schools" (1966, p. 41), and Hanson (1961) shows that there is little general understanding of the work of a public school superintendent.

A second obstacle is the perceived unattractiveness of educational administration as a career. In a study to determine senior

high school pupils' perceptions of the superintendency, Uzmack (1963) found that the pupils viewed the superintendent as having low status compared with other professionals in the community and that the majority had no interest in such a career because it entailed too much responsibility, was confining, and lacked appeal.

Another obstacle is the logistic difficulties candidates encounter in preparing to be educational administrators. Because of the traditional restrictions, persons eligible for preparatory programs are typically over thirty, have become well established in a career and a community, and have families and homes, with all the financial and other obligations entailed. To forfeit their accumulated security and slight their personal responsibilities is a sacrifice few are willing to make, particularly because of the generally inadequate scholarship and fellowship support available. Biographical documentation of some of these personal sacrifices is provided in a monograph published by the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (AASA 1966). In addition, Hall and McIntyre (1957) have raised questions about this "delayed-entry" career pattern.

Finally, the generally low status of preparation programs in educational administration constitutes a large obstacle to effective recruitment. Education is often assigned a low station in the academic "pecking order" within the university. Moreover, administrator preparation programs are frequently held in low esteem by practicing administrators who protest their "irrelevance" and "obsolescence":

> . . . to a man, they felt that both their preparatory programs and the in-service educational opportunities which they have had since entry into administrative posts were far from adequate for preparing them to resolve the problems which daily confront them. (Goldhammer and others, 1967, p. 154)

All these obstacles represent problems that must be resolved if recruitment of prospective superintendents into preparatory programs is to be improved.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

A few strategies for solving these recruitment problems are proposed in the recent literature. Hall and McIntyre suggest "the preparation of materials to be used in the elementary and secondary

schools. These materials might include guidance leaflets, resource units, colored slides or motion pictures, and other similar devices for portraying school administration as a career" (1957, p. 421). As Culbertson (1962) notes, others seeking leadership talent follow this approach, particularly with high school seniors, but those in educational administration tend to ignore this pool. Yet, Baughman's research (1966) demonstrates the potential effectiveness of the strategy, at least in changing some of the negative career perceptions held by many young people.

The advantages of a strong liberal arts background for school superintendents and the desirability of recruiting younger persons into administrator preparation programs have led to a second solution proposed by Goldhammer.

> . . . the identification of administrators quite early in their college careers so that programs of instruction can be geared to their acquiring that knowledge which will form the basis upon which their skills as diagnosticians and applicators will be developed. Unquestionably, the fields of the social sciences and the humane arts must become the recruiting ground from which will come the individuals who will be participants in the administrator's preparatory programs. (1968, p. 182)

Culbertson (1962), Walton (1962), and the New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership (1967), to name but a few, support this idea.

Another proposal for facilitating recruitment is that "on an experimental basis, the internship may be tried as a procedure for telescoping experiences for carefully selected students for whom the long experience route to an administrative position seems inappropriate" (AASA and UCEA 1964, p. 2). The development of degree programs in educational administration similar to those leading to the master of arts in teaching are also suggested. Such programs, it is believed, "will permit tapping the talent available among liberal arts and science majors, many of whom are searching for ways to make meaningful contributions to society" (New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership 1967, pp. 2-3).

Finally, Culbertson and Farquhar offer directions for needed change in recruitment and selection practices in the seventies:

1. During the 1970's recruitment and selection efforts will be increasingly influenced by the fact that activities of

researchers, developers, and administrators are gradually becoming more specialized and differentiated.

2. Programs to recruit and select administrators will need to assume that those who would effectively head the nation's schools in the 1970's will require unprecedented capacities for leadership.
3. Universities will need to make special efforts to continue to broaden the talent pools from which educational leaders are recruited and selected.
4. Since there are many forces affecting leadership requirements in education and since there are substantial needs to achieve adaptations in administrator recruitment and selection, existing certification requirements will need to be assessed and changed. (1970, pp. 11-12)

SELECTION

Selection can be viewed as either of two processes: the skimming of the most desirable candidates off the top of the pool of applicants, or the screening out of the weakest candidates regardless of quality of the group as a whole. If the first is the case, many complaints about the caliber of people admitted to preparatory programs may be directed at recruitment, for the available pool from which to skim may be inferior to begin with. If the second is the case, then admission of "undesirables" may be blamed on selection alone, particularly when one bears in mind that there is no shortage of certified administrators in the country today.

From the recent literature, it appears that the critical problem in selection at present is more a result of admitting weak applicants than of lacking strong candidates. As McIntyre has said: "Although we are fortunate in attracting into our field a few people who would undoubtedly compare favorably with the best in any other field, the average student of educational administration is so far below the average student in most other fields, in mental ability and in general academic performance, that the situation is little short of being a national scandal" (1966, p. 17). Data reported by AASA in its 1964 study of the professional preparation of school superintendents lend support to McIntyre's admonishment: "There is no clear indication . . . that there is a concerted national effort to

admit to preparation programs only those persons who rank in the upper quartile in learning ability" (1964, p. 23).

It seems clear that a major cause of the general low caliber of students in administrator preparation programs lies in the selection criteria employed. From a University of Minnesota study of admission procedures and standards for administrator training programs in forty-four UCEA member universities, two conclusions emerged rather clearly: (1) there is substantial variation across the country in the procedures and standards used for student admission into graduate programs in educational administration; and (2) there is considerable dissatisfaction with the validity and utility of the admissions procedures and standards employed. Although some universities are satisfied that their entrance criteria bear some relationship to a student's subsequent success in the graduate program, none of the universities is convinced its admissions standards are related to eventual success of the candidate as a school administrator (Davis 1968).

McIntyre offers a rather discouraging critique of some of the screening procedures most commonly employed:

> Of all the rituals encumbering the selection process, interviewing is undoubtedly the hoariest—and the sorriest. Nothing in the research on selection methodology is so completely established and repeatedly verified as is the unreliability of short interviews as they are usually conducted. . . .
>
> Unfortunately, the record of letters of recommendation is as dismal as that of interviewing. Although the subject has not been researched to any great extent, all available evidence indicates that the reading of letters of recommendation is approximately as enlightening as the reading of tea leaves. . . .
>
> Rating scales vary considerably in usefulness, but the usual scale is little if any better than the usual letter of recommendation. The traits to be rated are often of limited relevance, the points on the scale are seldom clearly defined, and leniency is so rampant that only the upper end of the scale is ordinarily used. (1966, pp. 7-8)

Elsewhere, McIntyre is even more devastating: "Self-selection is still the only selection that is to be found in many of our institutions. Taking all of our programs over the nation as a whole, the main admission requirement is that the person be present. On second thought, he doesn't even have to be present—we'll take him sight unseen" (1964, p. 4).

Nevertheless, McIntyre is not without constructive suggestions.

He identifies several promising approaches to selection that have not yet been significantly implemented in educational administration. These approaches include sociometrics, the situational performance test, the laboratory training approach, and the use of biographical items and measures of past achievement to predict creative behavior (1966, pp. 10-11). To these, Harlow (1962) would add some means of assessing the applicants' value systems. Andrews (1970) proposes a conceptual model for determining patterns of predecisional behavior of school administrators and a method for empirical verification of the model through content analysis of subjects' responses to complex problem-solving situations. The concepts treated are the relationships among identifiable patterns of predecisional behavior, environmental consequences of value or profit, and organismic and situational variables that possibly modify predecisional behavior. Cunningham and Nystrand (1969) recommend including practicing school administrators, in cooperation with university personnel, in the screening process.

McIntyre proposes that screening be continued during certain phases of the preparatory program. The student would be evaluated by a variety of means according to several behavioral categories, with the standards raised in each succeeding phase. He suggests:

> To assist in the process of quality control, we should agree on an aptitude test to be universally and uniformly administered, interpreted, and reported. Such tests are now given in other fields, such as medicine and law, and although they are far from perfect they do provide one basis on which institutions can compare students. Whether we should use an existing general aptitude test or develop one specifically for educational administration is debatable, but the important point is that institutions preparing school administrators need some way of comparing the results of their selection efforts in some acceptable and effective manner. (1966, p. 17)

Finally, Farquhar offers the following observation:

> Selection procedures are moving, on the one hand, toward the application of more rigorous measures of cognitive ability and, on the other hand, toward the development of more subjective assessments of a variety of behavioral and personality characteristics. Concentrated research is badly needed to devise screening mechanisms which have some validity in predicting successful administrative performance. (1969, p. 11)

5

Instructional Approaches

In its 1964 survey of preparation programs for school superintendents, AASA reported that "one thing . . . professors insisted upon saying, probably above all else, is that they are using a variety of teaching materials and techniques" (1964, p. 45). More specifically, the report states that "the use of simulated situations, game theory, cases, theory development, and problem-oriented seminars, in addition to or without the usual textbook-lecture-discussion technique, is mentioned in a majority of questionnaires even though no specific question was directed toward these approaches to learning" (1964, p. 45). The growth in use of nonlecture methods, however, has not been sufficient to satisfy everyone. Culbertson and Farquhar state that "more than one-third of the superintendents and over a quarter of the professors responding to the UCEA survey identified an over-reliance upon lectures as a weakness in their programs" (1971b, p. 11).

In the past few years, cases and simulations have been widely employed; some professors have used laboratory training exer-

cises, programmed instruction, and sensitivity training in preparing educational administrators. Regarding simulations, Culbertson and Farquhar point out that "the use of simulation has reportedly been introduced or expanded in almost 80 percent of the universities" (1971b, p. 12). The type most commonly employed is that based on the written in-basket technique, supplemented by multimedia background information, filmed problem stimuli, and taped interruptions. Cunningham identified a number of unresolved issues concerning the use of such simulations for instructional purposes, advising that:

> Special attention should be given to appraising the impact of simulated experiences on persons in training; considerable research opportunities surround the use of these devices and these ought not be ignored; continued attention is warranted in regard to the trainers—the persons who use the technique as professors; and finally, we should record our experiences with simulation more effectively in the future than we have in the past. (1969, p. 27)

Two less traditional approaches to simulation are being increasingly employed. The first is gaming, examples of which are the "Bargaining Game" developed by Horvat (1967) and the application of game theory to the analysis of conflicts-of-interest situations in administrator training, as described by Ohm (1968). The second is computer-based simulation, for which prototype problems now exist.

Although the above developments of instructional approaches for administrator preparation are, by and large, quite encouraging, some needs persist in this area. Boyan suggests, for example, that the development of entire systems of instructional materials and procedures should be a major objective in program design (1968, pp. 34-35). Culbertson recognizes a need for instructional materials designed to give students experience in dealing with problems of educational purpose and policy in today's world (1964, p. 329).

6

Field-Related Experiences

Many new instructional approaches attempt to bring the prospective administrator in contact with the reality he will encounter on placement. Unfortunately, this effort is limited because the reality is "manufactured," the behavior is "role-played," and the context is the controlled, comfortable environment of the classroom.

Authenticity can be approached in varying degrees, depending on the materials used and the ways in which they are used. Nevertheless, the reality of school administration can never be completely captured within the university setting. Consequently, institutions preparing administrators have developed other means for introducing their students to the reality of practice. These means, generally classified as field-related experiences, consist mainly of internships and apprenticeships, participation in field studies and surveys, and other practicum experiences integrated in the regular course structure of the preparatory program.

There is some agreement on the usefulness of field-related ex-

periences, particularly for relatively inexperienced students. Goldhammer and others (1967) found that approximately one-half of the institutions visited in his study provided extended opportunities for students to work in the field in one way or another. However, a review of the literature yields substantial information on only one type of field-related experience—the internship.

In 1963, Briner stated "there has been agreement . . . regarding the internship as an integral part of the total preparatory program" (1963, p. 5). Data collected during the same year by AASA suggest a trend in this direction: about four times as many universities offered internships in 1962-63 as in 1958-59. However, as Gregg points out, "even during 1962-63 less than one-half of the institutions offered internships and only a very small percentage of the students were involved" (1969, pp. 21-22). Moreover, there is little satisfaction with the internship as it is commonly implemented in local school districts. As Briner states:

> There has been little agreement among educators as to what pattern of experience should constitute the internship with the result that internships, where included in preparation programs, vary significantly in their scope and administration. . . .
>
> Assessment of the present status of the internship prompts the conclusion that the internship represents a response to little or no direction in preparation. The internship may be more an end in itself than facilitative of explicitly designed purposes. (1963, pp. 5 and 7)

The UCEA study of superintendent preparation programs found general dissatisfaction among universities:

> Criticisms were directed at such factors as a lack of diversity in internships, a haphazard and variable (rather than systematic) approach to incorporating field activities into preparatory programs, a lack of individualization in "molding" field experiences to students' individual needs and goals, fragmentary participation in comprehensive surveys, and poorly planned and supervised internships. (Culbertson and Farquhar 1971b, p. 12)

In response to this kind of criticism, several writers have sought to establish working parameters for the planning and implementation of internship programs. Lonsdale and McCarty (1963) suggest several substantive guidelines for the superintendency internship; AASA and UCEA (1964) propose a number of action guides for the internship in administrative preparation; Sybouts (1968) identifies

two general conditions required to make an internship program productive; and Ramseyer (1963) discusses issues and problems that must be resolved in designing a meaningful internship experience. Similarly, Culbertson observes that, to realize the full potential of the internship as a component of administrative preparation, further work is needed to achieve five goals: "more refined procedures for selecting school districts in which to locate interns; adequate and clear definitions of desired learnings; effective and adequate supervision; stable methods of financing; research to illuminate and improve the internship" (1964, pp. 327-328).

The final report of a Ford Foundation interuniversity internship program conducted at Cornell University, Syracuse University, the University of Rochester, and the State University of New York at Buffalo includes some insightful information on the effectiveness of internship programs. The report concludes with thirteen recommendations, including a suggested model with guidelines for an internship program and a general sequence of experiences for the university staff, interns, and school administrators (State University of New York at Buffalo [1969]).

Most of the suggestions made by these writers are designed to improve the traditional educational administration internship—that is, the pattern in which the intern spends from a few weeks to a full year in the office of a single administrator in one school district. Several recent proposals would break with this tradition. The UCEA Committee on Guides for Improving Preparatory Programs proposes this slight variation: "Interns with unusual competence might work with a number of districts. Under such an arrangement interns would not only have opportunities to work with different administrators, but they would also have opportunities to apply theoretical learnings to a variety of problems in various situational contexts" (UCEA 1962, p. 27).

Similarly, Cunningham and Nystrand suggest that problem-centered (rather than role-centered) "targeted field experiences" be developed whereby students would undergo, early in their preparation, "brief, but intense, exposure to important realities of administrative life" by being at the side of administrators as they deal with crucial issues affecting the schools (1969, pp. 19-20).

A more radical departure from the traditional internship is present in the UCEA committee's suggestion that "internship experiences could be provided in places other than local school

districts: (a) in intermediate units of education, (b) in state departments of education, and (c) in professional educational associations at the state and national level" (1962, p. 27). Still further removed from tradition is the proposal inherent in the following statement by the UCEA-AASA task force: "As the schools affect and are affected by such agencies as state departments of education, state school boards associations, professional associations, state legislatures, city governments, and the U.S. Office of Education, opportunities for internships in these agencies emerge" (AASA and UCEA 1964, p. 1).

Suggestions such as these have been implemented in the "rotating internship," an innovative component of a three-year doctoral program for educational leadership at Teachers College, Columbia University. Cresswell and Goettel describe the program: "Beginning at the end of his first year in the program, each Fellow works in three to four intern situations. The situations are selected on the bases of their appropriateness to the Fellow's needs and interests, the quality of the organization concerned, and (most importantly) the competency of the professional administrator for whom the student will work" (1970, p. 8).

Reports from universities indicate "at least half-a-dozen universities have adopted the 'rotating' internship, and several others indicated an intent to do so within the next few years" (Culbertson and Farquhar 1971b, p. 12). However, other innovative proposals seem to be largely ignored. Among these is Hooker's suggestion that some nationwide organization approve or sponsor school districts wishing to participate in internship programs. Hooker argues that such an arrangement would provide the following advantages (among others) over current methods:

1. A respectable professional or accrediting organization would assume responsibility for certifying to the ability of school districts to provide the quality of experience which is needed.
2. The local school district would carry far greater responsibility for organizing the internship program and for supervising and evaluating the interns.
3. Greater specialization would result as sponsoring districts established a reputation for excellence in some phase of educational leadership.
4. For the use of universities and students a directory would be published of the approved schools indicating the number and type of internships for which member school districts have been approved.

5. The sponsoring school district would be free to select interns from among those applying from a number of universities. (1963, pp. 24-30)

Another neglected proposal is that school administrators and university personnel cooperatively design, on a statewide basis, some central criteria for the development and operation of internships. In addition to such recognized advantages of interinstitutional cooperation as consistency, communication, and increased input resources, Brittell (1963) argues that benefits would accrue from the fact that groups of administrators are usually already organized on a statewide basis and that universities within a state operate in accordance with the same legal framework.

The literature does not indicate these two proposals have received the attention they appear to merit. Possible exceptions to this generalization are the Mott internship program currently operating in Michigan and the now defunct internship program that was conducted cooperatively by several universities in New York State.

In conclusion, we emphasize that neither the internship nor other field-related experiences are universally accepted as integral components of preparatory programs for school superintendents. Despite the "increasing recognition of field-related experiences as an essential element in the superintendent's preparation . . . there is considerable dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of these experiences as they are typically constituted" (Farquhar 1969, p. 11).

7

Student Research

Research conducted by students as a training method receives relatively sparse coverage in the recent literature. However, a few references provide some indication of the trends and needs in this area.

Student involvement in research is generally viewed as an important aspect of the prospective superintendent's preparation. A majority of the "jury of experts" participating in Beckner's study (1966) considered research experience essential for these students. According to Reller, one of the ten areas in which the superintendent needs a high level of competence is "the character and potentialities of research; research design, administration, and utilization as applied to a wide variety of issues in education and related areas" (1962, p. 110).

Although in Gregg's words "the field of educational administration has not been distinguished by its research, whether done by students or professors" (1969, p. 37), there are indications that improvement is occurring, at least in research conducted by students.

AASA (1964) noted a "quite obvious" shift toward competence in research when it compared the 1962-63 programs surveyed with those examined in 1958-59. Farquhar observes that "the sophistication in both design and methodology of student research is increasing, and there is growing evidence of integrated, programmatic research thrusts involving several students and of greater participation by students in faculty research projects" (1969, p. 11).

The suggestion most frequently made regarding student research is that research expectations, experiences, and requirements for prospective school administrators be differentiated from those for prospective researchers in educational administration. For example, Andrews supports the view that "traditional graduate research training, and especially the thesis requirement, is not highly contributive to the practitioner role." He sees the practitioner having a "double concern" with research:

> His first concern is as an accomplished consumer of research, particularly of the development sort. To perform this function his training should include an understanding of statistics sufficient to interpret and appraise the research. . . .
>
> The practitioner's second concern with research, if the term is used broadly, is in relation to his vital function as a decision-maker. . . . The research process so closely resembles the decision-making process that the knowledge and skills that have been developed for conducting research may be readily modified to apply directly to decision-making. . . . (1963, pp. 363-364)

Culbertson (1970) also supports the concept of differentiated research expectations and proposes three research alternatives for school administrator candidates. The first is a supervised internship experience supplemented by independent reading and periodic seminars. Near the end of the experience the student would prepare a paper describing the "reading which he had completed during the last year of his study, the decisions and policy issues to which the knowledge acquired during his three years of study seemed most relevant and least relevant, and examples of the way decisions were shaped by the knowledge acquired."

As the second alternative, a team of graduate students (prospective administrators) and professors would select and define a major administrative or leadership problem in education, generate alternative solutions, logically evaluate the various solutions with the aid

of personnel in a school district, and then assist these personnel in implementing and testing one of the solutions.

Culbertson's third option is a program in which a team of prospective administrators would devote their final year of preparation to studying systems analysis and operations research concepts. The students would identify those concepts most relevant to decision-making in educational administration and then engage in field work in which they would apply selected techniques to actual decision problems in school districts. Finally, each student would prepare a paper in which he would report on his team's activities and results and present his ideas on the kinds of changes needed in school districts for better management planning and more effective use of operations research and systems analysis.

With a few exceptions, the potential in these proposals for differentiating the research of student administrators from that of student researchers remains to be tested.

The future of student research holds several challenges:

> . . . the need for more faculty assistance and for improved preparation in research methods, the need for greater individualized flexibility in the selection of research topics and approaches, and the need for increased emphasis upon research (especially by prospective superintendents) designed to contribute to the understanding and resolution of contemporary administrative problems and policy issues in education. (Farquhar 1969, pp. 11-12)

8

Graduation Requirements

Apparently, one graduation requirement in virtually all universities preparing school superintendents at the doctoral level is student research or some substitute such as a "developmental project." However, there are other requirements that do not receive unanimous support: foreign language competency, comprehensive examinations, courses in "minor" areas of study, internships, and full-time residencies. In fact, recent evidence indicates declining endorsement for some of these requirements. For example, Farquhar finds a trend "in the reduction or elimination of the foreign language requisite; acceptable substitutes in many institutions are data processing, research design, or a related discipline" (1969, p. 12). Aside from a few passing references such as this, internships and residency requirements are the only graduation requirements accorded any significant attention in the literature. Therefore, the discussion in the remainder of this chapter is limited to their consideration.

INTERNSHIPS

The recent growth in opportunities for internships during advanced preparation was noted in the chapter on field-related experiences. However, the extent to which the internship is a requirement for graduation is a different matter, as Ramseyer reports:

> It seems that, while many institutions make provisions for an internship, relatively few of the persons preparing to become school administrators are taking advantage of this opportunity. Obviously it is not the custom of most institutions who prepare school administrators to require an internship experience to complete the program. None of the fifty states . . . requires the internship for certification for an administrative position in the public schools. (1966, p. 139)

Nevertheless, the literature seems to support a required internship. Tope and others note that "some form of practical field experience is coming to be recognized as an essential element in preparation" (1965, p. 15). Farquhar observes that "some persons predict that the future will bring greater emphasis on required field-related experiences in the preparation of superintendents" (1969, p. 12).

RESIDENCIES

Movement toward a required period of residency during preparation is more evident than movement toward a required internship. For example, the "jury of experts" participating in Beckner's survey "agreed that residence study is essential. There was also unanimous agreement that the residence requirement should consist of at least two semesters during the academic year" (1966, p. 147). Burbank (1968) and McIntyre (1966) support a required residency of two consecutive semesters or one academic year, and Farquhar adds that "a majority of leading universities are now requiring one academic year of full-time study, and a few have substituted a two-year residency requirement" (1969, p. 12).

The typical defense of the residency is based on benefits such as those noted by the New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership: "library facilities are discovered and used, dialogue between professors and students is facilitated, interchanges between students occur and the student has adequate time to do the critical thinking and assimilation of material necessary to

make it useful" (1967, p. 4). To these advantages, the interviewees in a survey by the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA) added freedom from the distractions of day-to-day operational decisions and opportunity to learn how social scientists view education (AASA 1963a, pp. 19-20). Neagley's study (1967) of faculty and students in thirty-six UCEA member universities yielded "opportunity to participate in research" as an additional gain derived from full-time residency.

9

Program Evaluation and Development

Prior to Culbertson and others' 1969 study of doctoral programs for preparing school superintendents, little in the literature suggested that those responsible for preparing school superintendents were seeking to evaluate and develop their programs in any systematic fashion. This is not to say, however, that the need for such activity had not been recognized. For example, Gregg stated that "Departments of Educational Administration should make thorough appraisals of preparation programs. There should be critical review of objectives, inventory of problems and needs, critical appraisal of present activities, and utilization of all pertinent resources for program development" (1969, p. 34). In 1966, the UCEA central staff similarly noted that

> institutions, in order to insure quality offerings will . . . need to have (1) feedback arrangements for monitoring operations within the responsible unit; (2) methods for examining emerging and changing research, development and training requirements; and (3) ways of designing institutional adaptations and innovations needed to meet challenging requirements. (1966a, p. 4)

Although personnel at a number of institutions visited by Goldhammer and his colleagues claimed to be placing more emphasis on the behavioral sciences, researchers in the study were unable to determine the extensiveness of program changes. The researchers surmised that, at least in some instances, "program change occurs primarily as individual instructors up-date their offerings" (1967, p. 105). Thus, at the time of the study, there was little evidence that universities were engaging in systematic program evaluation and development. Only one of the universities in the sample indicated the use of superintendents as a source of information for program development. Apparently only a few were allocating institutional funds and professional time to the careful study of problems facing superintendents and to the careful revision of preparatory programs in accordance with the findings of such study. Goldhammer concluded that "few institutions are actively engaged in curriculum development or in planning major revisions in their programs for preparing educational administrators" (1967, p. 105).

Drawing on the findings of the 1969 study by Culbertson and others, Farquhar reports that

> the planning and evaluation of preparatory programs are becoming matters of growing concern to university personnel, as reflected in the recent emergence of relatively systematic approaches to the formulation of goals and the assessment of results. . . . There is also increasing evidence of the utilization of external evaluations and of student representation in departmental decision making. (1969, p. 12)

However, before planning and evaluation can be universally implemented in departments of educational administration, a number of obstacles need to be surmounted. Goldhammer's study identifies some of them:

> Several respondents felt there were too many colleges and universities in the state engaged in administrative preparation. . . . The proliferation of preparatory programs results in a diffused distribution of students and smaller enrollments than are desirable to maintain quality programs. Insufficient student enrollment was reported to be a barrier to the expansion of the curriculum, the employment of sufficient staff to round out staff competencies, and the effective utilization of student interaction. Several respondents reported that departments of educational administration were understaffed, resulting in excessive work loads. Too little time for planning and evaluating programs also prevents curriculum development. (1967, pp. 105-106)

One approach recommended for overcoming some of these barriers is that units external to universities be established to aid departments of educational administration in continuous self-evaluation and adaptation. More specifically, the UCEA central staff (1967) recommends directly involving practicing administrators in the development and assessment of preparatory programs. Finally, Farquhar reports there is

> a recognized need . . . for the application of much more sophisticated systems concepts in program design, which will require greater precision in the definition of behavioral objectives according to measurable criteria and continuous follow-up determinations of graduates' performance. (1969, p. 12)

In fact, it has been suggested that there are legal dangers inherent in the fact that the relevance of preparatory programs to administrative behavior cannot be directly and clearly demonstrated at present (Bridges and Baehr 1971).

10

Department Functions and Staffing

Like most divisions within universities, departments of educational administration are frequently plagued by the problem of understaffing due to inadequate resources. The staffing of a university department specializing in professional preparation, however, encounters special problems not experienced in staffing other university divisions. These problems result primarily from the need to secure staff expertise both in the skills of the profession for which the students are being prepared and in the disciplines from which content is drawn for the preparatory program. These dual needs raise questions about the desirable balance of functional specializations among staff members. The recent literature reveals that departments of educational administration, by and large, have not yet answered these questions satisfactorily.

Goldhammer and colleagues examined the need for faculty members with expertise in the skills of the profession, concluding that "many of the programs [for preparing administrators] are staffed with individuals who cannot relate effectively to the ad-

ministrator in the larger school districts today nor deal adequately in their preparatory courses with the problems which these administrators confront" (1967, p. 156). Some of the superintendents interviewed by Goldhammer were concerned that too many professors have never been superintendents and "don't know the realities of the job," or that they have been associated with the university so long they have lost contact with the problems of the field. Several recommended that college faculty should be forced back into the field periodically so they can maintain proper perspective, a proposal supported by Cunningham and Nystrand (1969).

On the other hand, regarding the need for expertise in the relevant disciplines, some superintendents were concerned that departments of educational administration are staffed by "too many former superintendents who 'have retreated to the university' " (Goldhammer and others 1967, p. 111). Elsewhere, Goldhammer states:

> Ideally, every university which has an administrative preparatory program should have someone on the staff in educational administration who is able to communicate effectively with the social scientists as a result of his broad knowledge and competency in the social sciences, and at the same time at each university there should be some social scientist who has made a study of the educational milieu as the primary focus of his scholarly attention. (1963, p. 42)

The particular difficulty of achieving this interaction has been discussed previously in the chapter on program structure.

Historically, the trend in functions and staffing for departments of educational administration has moved from an early focus on resolving the practice-related need to a more recent attempt at achieving better balance through increased emphasis on the discipline-related need.* This trend and some of its corollaries are described by the UCEA central staff:

> There is evidence that public school experience is seen by those who employ professors of educational administration as an important

*See, for example, Roald F. Campbell, "The Professorship in Educational Administration: Preparation," in *The Professorship in Educational Administration,* eds. Donald J. Willower and Jack Culbertson (Columbus: UCEA, 1964), pp. 18-19; and Keith Goldhammer, "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the In-Service Education of the Professional Administrator," in *Continuing Education of School Administrators,* eds. Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1966), p. 41.

> requirement for appointment to professorship. . . . The longer period of teaching and administrative experience, which is required of most candidates for professorships in educational administration (as compared with professors in most other subject specializations), is apparently viewed by most of those responsible for appointments as having certain advantages from the standpoint of teaching and field contacts. . . .
>
> It is likely . . . (however) that the career pattern of most professors of educational administration effectively reduces their research potential and capacity. (1966b, pp. 1-2)

More recently though, Farquhar reported that "the main tendency in departmental staffing is toward the addition of relatively young professors who are short on administrative experience but long on training in the social sciences, competency in research, or specialization in such emergent content areas as systems analysis, intergovernmental relationships, and planning technologies" (1969, p. 12).

Accompanying this trend toward youth in departmental staffing is a corresponding shift to substantive specialization in staff functions. Culbertson identifies four ways of viewing current patterns of faculty specializations:

> Two of these perspectives, which are defined in terms of administrative position and administrative function, have their roots in practice. They are views which historically were the first to evolve. The two most recent perspectives, which have disciplinary and multidisciplinary orientations, have their roots in structure of knowledge as found in university communities. (1966, p. 3)

From data collected by Shaplin in 1964, it appears that at that time a rather even balance between these two pairs of perspectives had been achieved among universities (but not necessarily within them). Thirty-eight UCEA member universities responded to his question asking which areas of specialization are viewed as necessary to a well-staffed administrative program. Shaplin found an almost equal distribution between responses favoring practice-related categories of specialization and those seeming to favor discipline-related specializations: specialties related to "level" (elementary, secondary, higher education, the principalship, the superintendency, and so forth) were cited by six institutions; "field" specialties (school plant, finance, law, personnel administration, business management, and so forth) were noted by more than fifteen respondents; "disciplinary" specialties were named by six

universities; and "multidisciplinary" specialties (research methods, administrative theory, organizational analysis, and so forth) were mentioned by about fifteen study participants.

Although Shaplin's findings show considerable agreement *among* universities on the need for a balance between the practice-related and discipline-related specializations, they indicate nothing about agreement *within* departments of educational administration on the need for such a balance. In promoting balance within departments, Campbell has likened the professor of educational administration to Guetzkow's "developer"—the link between the practitioner and the pure scientist:

> The developer has at least four important functions: (1) to maintain an orientation with respect to the general field of education, the field of administration, and the social science disciplines; (2) to establish two-way communication between those who seek to discover knowledge and those who attempt to apply knowledge; (3) to determine the relevance of social science concepts and findings and plan the adaptation of these concepts and findings to school situations; and (4) to select and train practitioners. (1963, pp. 342-343)

It is apparent that this type of intradepartmental balance has not yet been achieved to any significant extent in many universities preparing school superintendents. Goldhammer observes that "some institutions are obviously engaging in administrative preparatory programs without the number or quality of professors essential to provide for the range of skill and knowledge needed by the practicing superintendents" (1967, p. 114).

The UCEA central staff also notes "inadequacies in the current definitions of functions of modern departments of educational administration and of the staffing patterns needed by these departments" (1965b, p. 57). The problem is not simply one of achieving balance in the recruitment and selection of professors of educational administration. As Lortie (1962) suggests, perhaps an even more basic need is to develop special programs of study designed specifically to prepare persons for the professorship as a particularized role. Similarly, Farquhar recommends devising "a variety of meaningful continuing education experiences for professors" and according "greater recognition to teaching and advising students as valued professorial functions" (1969, p. 12).

Regarding the future, Fogarty (1972) predicts that professorial expertise will be differentiated neither according to administrative levels or task areas (as in the fifties) nor according to academic

subdisciplines or bodies of theory (as in the sixties), but increasingly according to functional responsibilities rather than substantive specializations. That is, while most professors will continue to teach, their roles will vary depending on whether their activities are focused primarily on research (the pursuit and discovery of new knowledge), synthesis (the collation and codification of existing knowledge), or development (the application of knowledge to the resolution of problems in the field).

11

Continuing Education Programs

> Although neglected at the present time by most of the preparatory institutions and related agencies, the continuous in-service education of administrators is one of the most imperative needs for the revitalization of education in our society. To provide those experiences which can effectively assist the trained professional to modify his behavior, to obtain the new knowledge which he needs, and to build new skills based upon contemporary technology is probably the greatest challenge facing the field of educational administration and all of its institutions and agencies today. (Goldhammer 1968, p. 183)

The sense of significance and urgency in the above quotation is characteristic of the recent literature on continuing education programs for school superintendents, whether it is concerned with assessing present offerings or with projecting new approaches. The literature pertinent to these two concerns is reviewed here.

Assessments of Present Offerings

Recent assessments of current continuing education programs for educational administrators present a discouraging picture. The

UCEA central staff (1966b), for example, observes there has been much less progress—in terms of organizational innovation and effective synthesis—in continuing education programs than in preservice programs for school administrators. The staff cites this relative failure as one of the major problems that those in universities must seek to resolve.

The results of Howsam's mail survey of continuing education programs in thirty-five UCEA member universities support this generalization. The study turned up little evidence of any real ferment in continuing education and few responses to a request for information on prospective new developments. In the light of these data, Howsam remarks that "one gets the impression that we are, by and large, sitting on our collective hands at a time when we can ill afford to be warming our hands by this method" (1966, p. 17).

Similarly, college and university respondents participating in the 1967 study by Goldhammer and others expressed disappointment with the continuing education programs they sponsor, in part because of the generally poor attendance at their conferences and workshops. Opinions of the superintendents participating in the study varied on this subject. Although many were highly supportive of continuing education programs because they provide inspiration and information on recent developments in school administration, others felt these programs focused on outdated problems and issues. Urban school superintendents, in particular, reported that continuing education programs did not meet their needs. From these reactions, the authors concluded that "in educational administration, it seems that little is being done in the in-service education of superintendents, and even less is done well" (1967, p. 114). Farquhar restated this conclusion two years later: "General dissatisfaction exists in universities with regard to their provision of in-service programs for superintendents" (1969, p. 12).

A variety of factors are postulated as reasons for the apparent inadequacies of current continuing education programs for school administrators. Albright (1962), Goldhammer (1967), and Howsam (1966), for example, all complain that these programs tend to be too brief, and Albright adds that they are largely limited to considering the "technical or tactical aspects of the job." Howsam also notes that the clientele for the programs are largely self-selected and include a variety of people from a range of different positions, and that the programs themselves consist largely of

"sporadic activities conducted in rather traditional patterns." Another weakness, identified by some of the superintendents in the Goldhammer study, was that continuing education programs tended to be "too theoretically oriented, utilizing consultants who were not closely enough associated with the realities of school administration" (1967, p. 113). In summarizing their findings, Goldhammer and his colleagues observe:

> Few, if any, of the programs are based upon a realistic perception of the needs of administrators in the field. Few appear to be established upon sound principles of professional education. Few seem to be developed with any consistency of effort toward the attainment of well established goals, and relatively few receive from school superintendents the patronage which they want. (1967, p. 157)

AASA (1963c) charges that responsibility for providing continuing education assistance to school administrators has not been lodged with any particular agency or institution in this country. As a result, such programs are treated by universities as secondary to preservice preparation and suffer in the allocation of financial and personnel resources. Other liabilities identified by AASA are the extent to which credit hours become a primary concern, and the tendency for the programs to result from uncoordinated trial-and-error attempts to meet immediate needs rather than from long-range, careful planning reflecting a "continuous thread of purpose."

To this impressive inventory of causative weaknesses, the UCEA central staff appends the notion that "the psychological acceptance of the relevance and utility of new concepts by those practicing educational administration has undoubtedly been somewhat difficult" (1966b, p. 62).

Projections of New Approaches

Current problems of continuing education programs for school superintendents are not all going to be resolved through one massive innovation. Indeed, it is likely that several problems will not be resolved within the next five or ten years. Nevertheless, incremental gains can be made; the literature projects a number of new approaches with this aim in mind.

A few suggestions relate primarily to program content. Scott reports that the eighty-two superintendents interviewed in his study were "practically unanimous in their requests for continuous in-

service opportunities to study collective negotiations" (1966, p. 92). Harlow calls for the support of "reasonably sophisticated and demanding in-service seminars, short courses and workshops in the humanities, designed for working school administrators" (1962, p. 71). And Willis sees a need for continuing education content that would "avoid a narrow and expedient approach to such topics as buses and bonds and some of the other day-to-day operating procedures and would deal instead with some of the broad economic and social issues confronting us" (1962, p. 122).

According to Farquhar, however, no clear trend appears to be emerging in the content of continuing education programs:

> Some institutions are expanding their short-term offerings and attempting to better address the immediate needs and emergent problems on the "firing line"; others are projecting longer-term mid-career experiences for practitioners; and still others are actively seeking to cooperate with the growing variety of off-campus agencies becoming involved in continuing education. (1969, p. 12)

Although there is some concern with revitalizing the content of traditional types of continuing education programs, writers are paying more attention to the projection of new structures, mechanisms, and processes for facilitating improved continuing education opportunities. Some authors base their proposals on the assumption that the primary responsibility for providing continuing education programs rests with universities. Thus, AASA's Committee for the Advancement of School Administration has suggested that institutions of higher education must develop a commitment to continuing education that is as firmly established as their commitment to preservice programs, and that this commitment should be given tangible form through:

- Allocating funds to support an in-service program. (An amount equal to one-fourth of expenditures budgeted for administrative programs is recommended as a minimum.)
- Establishing a planning committee to develop the broad outlines of an in-service program.
- Making a staff member individually responsible for an in-service program.
- Employing personnel to work with administrators and other employees in local school systems.
- Planning and sustaining research projects to provide information needed to deal with important educational problems.

- Establishing and implementing policies to make resources in all departments of the university available for use in in-service programs.
- Developing a plan of financial support for an in-service program without relying primarily on charges for credit hours. (AASA 1966, passim)

Working from the same assumption of university responsibility, the UCEA central staff (1966b) proposed four new means of advancing continuing administrator education:

1. publishing a new periodical with abstracts of reports relevant to practicing administrators
2. making available to practitioners videotapes of interviews with school administrators who have succeeded in implementing innovative solutions to pressing educational problems
3. designing a set of materials to inform administrators of the nature and use of new sources of information relevant to their problems and needs
4. developing, through interinstitutional cooperation, plans for experiences and packages of materials relating to significant contemporary problems in education

Cunningham and Nystrand (1969) make two additional suggestions for improving university-based continuing education programs: (1) that postdoctoral fellowships be offered to practicing administrators on a semester or academic year basis; and (2) that "interdisciplinary management seminars" of two to four weeks' duration, designed by an interdepartmental faculty group, be developed for social agency and government administrators as well as schoolmen.

Not all advocates of new approaches to continuing education programs assume that such efforts will be university-based. Both Goldhammer and Scott cite a need for joint efforts among a variety of other organizations. Goldhammer suggests that major universities "establish throughout a state inservice education centers jointly staffed by school districts and the major training institution" (1963, p. 43). Albright proposes that an entirely new and independent facility be initiated to serve the continuing education needs of school administrators. This agency, which he refers to as "an administrative staff college in education," would serve generally to help practitioners do the following things:

> (1) acquire an articulate conceptual foundation, increased professional knowledge and sophistication, and greater comprehension of their roles in society, (2) develop sharper sympathies and flexibilities, improved analytical skills, self-assurance, and a finer appreciation of the complexities of our culture and of the modern world. (1962, p. 150)

Finally, Knezevich (1969) developed perhaps the most ambitious and elaborate plan for the continuing education of administrators outside the university: the creation of a national academy for school executives. Four academic task forces studied the structural elements, fiscal requirements, program characteristics, and feasibility of a model for a national academy. Three presession programs were conducted to test the reactions of administrators to program content, staff, methods, sites and facilities, fees, and amounts of time involved. The conclusions were that (1) school administrators showed considerable interest in a national academy; (2) the academy should offer programs at several levels, including short-term clinics and seminars and longer residential sessions; and (3) although it is fiscally feasible to launch the short-term seminars and clinics, more development is needed on other levels.

It is encouraging that, unlike the vast majority of projected new approaches to continuing education that remain unfulfilled, Knezevich's plan for a national academy for school executives has been almost fully implemented. AASA's National Academy for School Executives, founded in 1969, each year conducts more than forty different workshops and seminars on such topics as collective negotiations, PPBS, integration, and school-community relations.

12

Conclusion

Of the ten components of preparatory programs we have considered, by far the greatest amount of coverage in the literature is accorded to program content, with particular emphasis on material from the social and behavioral sciences. Relatively neglected components are program structure, student research, graduation requirements, and program evaluation and development. The lack of attention given these four components may be explained by the likelihood that they have been viewed as matters peculiar to the concerns and constraints of individual universities. In contrast, program content, which in effect defines the body of knowledge that is "educational administration," has been viewed as the property of the profession at large.

Other examples of selective coverage in the literature are also evident. Within the component of field-related experiences, for example, the internship is the only activity that receives much attention. Regarding graduation requirements, published scholarship tends to ignore all requisites except the residency, student research,

and field-related experiences.

Although a few reasonably specific criticisms appear in the literature, the majority of published statements are relatively imprecise and general. There is much repetition of broad platitudes, but little explicit analysis of trends and needs. Further, the platitudes tend largely to be negative in tone. It is easier to be critical than to be constructive. Apparently, most authors writing about administrator preparation either have chosen not to accept the greater challenge of constructiveness or have been overly modest in reporting their achievements and offering their solutions.

Thus, it may be concluded that the literature devoted to the preparation of school administrators tends to be selective in focus, general in nature, and negative in attitude.

One of the hallmarks of a profession is the willingness of its members to share new knowledge and practices with one another. While such sharing is becoming increasingly common among groups seeking primarily to advance the *study* of educational administration, it seems to have been largely lacking among those seeking to improve the *preparation* of school administrators. Apparently, program designers hesitate to report their plans, innovations, and achievements; to view the study of and experimentation with preparatory programs as legitimate areas of scholarly endeavour; to be specifically critical or laudatory of one another's practices and proposals; and to address the future with any degree of conviction. As a result, the present literature on administrator preparation programs does not reflect the "state of the art," nor does it contribute much of worth to those seeking to advance the "art."

Nevertheless, there is encouraging evidence that these problems have been recognized and are being directly addressed. Within the past three years as much research has been done on the preparation of educational administrators as during the previous decade. The results of some of this research are finding their way into various publications, notably under the auspices of UCEA. The 1970-71 series in the *UCEA Newsletter*, under the title "Preparing Educational Leaders," is a good example. Similarly, the willingness of program designers to share their plans and achievements through the literature has increased in the past several years, as reflected in the "Innovations in Preparation" series of articles published in the *UCEA Newsletter* since 1969-70. It is hoped this trend will be furthered by the monographs that compose this series.

Bibliography

Achilles, Charles M. "Employing the Humanities in Administrator Preparation," *UCEA Newsletter*, 12, 1 (October 1970).

Albright, A. D. "An Administrative Staff College for Education." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

American Association of School Administrators. *The Case for On-Campus Residence*. Washington, D.C.: Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, 1963.

———. *The Education of a School Superintendent*. Washington, D.C.: 1963.

———. *In-Service Education for School Administration*. Washington, D.C.: 1963.

———. *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools*. Washington, D.C.: 1964.

———. *In-Service Programs for School Administration*. Washington, D.C.: Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, 1966.

———. *The American School Superintendent*. Washington, D.C.: 1971.

American Association of School Administrators and University Council for Educational Administration. "The Internship in Administrative Preparation: Some Action Guides," 1964.

Anderson, Walter A., and Lonsdale, Richard C. "Learning Administrative Behavior." In *Administrative Behavior in Education*, edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Andrews, John H. M. "Differentiated Research Training for Students of Administration." In *Educational Research: New Perspectives*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.

Andrews, Richard L. "Utilization of a Selection Criteria for Screening Applicants for Administrative Training for the Prediction of Patterns of Predecisional Behavior at the End of the Training Period." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March 1970.

Baughman, M. Dale. "Sharpening the Image of School Administrators." *Illinois School Research*, May 1966.

Beckner, Weldon E. "A Proposal for Regional Organization of Graduate Study for Public School Superintendents in Eight Rocky Mountain States." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, School of Education, University of Colorado, 1966.

Boardman, Gerald R. *A Computer-Based Feedback Model for Simulation Exercises Involving School Administrators. Final Report.* Madison: Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, 1969. 292 pages. ED 039 779 MF $0.65 HC $9.87.

Boyan, Norman J. "Problems and Issues of Knowledge Production and Utilization." In *Knowledge Production and Utilization in Educational Administration*, edited by Terry L. Eidell and Joanne M. Kitchel. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

Bridges, Edwin M., and Baehr, Melany E. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures." *Administrator's Notebook*, 14, 5 (January 1971).

Briner, Conrad. "The Role of Internships in the Total Preparation Program for Educational Administration: A Frontier Perspective." In *The Internship in Administrative Preparation*, edited by Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Brittell, Robert W. "State-Wide Approaches to Developing Internship Programs: New Directions." In *The Internship in Administrative Preparation*, edited by Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Brown, Charles E. "Educating Administrators for Education." A Ford Foundation reprint, 1968.

Burbank, Natt B. *The Superintendent of Schools: His Headaches and Rewards.* Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.

Campbell, Roald F. "Training Research Professors of Educational Administration." In *Educational Research: New Perspectives*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers

and Publishers, 1963.

———. "The Professorship in Educational Administration: Preparation." In *The Professorship in Educational Administration*, edited by Donald J. Willower and Jack Culbertson. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

Cheal, John E. "The Art of Administration." *Educational Administration Reporter*, 1, 1 (January-February 1967).

Corwin, Ronald G. "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1, 3 (Autumn 1965).

Cresswell, Anthony M., and Goettel, Robert J. "Rotating Internships and Situational Analyses." *UCEA Newsletter*, 11, 3 (February 1970).

Culbertson, Jack A. "New Perspectives: Implications for Program Change," *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

———. "Common and Specialized Content in the Preparation of Administrators." In *Preparation Programs for School Administrators: Common and Specialized Learnings*, edited by Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963.

———. "The Preparation of Administrators." In *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*, (63rd. yearbook), edited by Daniel E. Griffiths. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964.

———. "Post-Doctoral Education for Professors." In *UCEA Annual Report, 1965-66*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

———. "Differentiated Training for Professors and Educational Administrators." Paper prepared for Vice-Presidential Address, American Educational Research Association, 1970.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Farquhar, Robin H. "Recruiting and Selecting Candidates for Administrative Preparation." *UCEA Newsletter*, 12, 1 (October 1970).

———. "Content in Administrator Preparation." *UCEA Newsletter*, 12, 3 (April 1971).

———. "Methods Employed in Administrative Preparation." *UCEA Newsletter*, 12, 4 (July 1971).

Culbertson, Jack A.; Cullinan, Paul; Downey, Loren; Horvat, John; and Ruderman, Robert. *The Design and Development of Prototype Instructional Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. Final Report.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1968. 269 pages. ED 019 723 MF $0.65 HC $9.87.

Culbertson, Jack; Farquhar, Robin H.; Fogarty, Bryce M.; and Shibles, Mark R., eds. *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973 (in press).

Culbertson, Jack; Farquhar, Robin H.; Gaynor, Alan K.; and Shibles, Mark R. *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies. Final Report.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969.

Cullinan, Paul, and Ruderman, Robert. "A Prototype Computer-Based System." In *The Design and Development of Prototype Instructional Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. Final Report,* by Jack A. Culbertson and others. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1968.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Simulation and the Preparation of Educational Administrators." In *Educational Administration: International Perspectives,* edited by George Baron, Dan H. Cooper, and William G. Walker. New York: Rand-McNally & Co., 1969.

Cunningham, Luvern L., and Nystrand, Raphael O. "Toward Greater Relevance in Preparation Programs for Urban School Administrators." *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 5, 1 (Winter 1969).

Cunningham, Luvern L.; Downey, Lawrence W.; and Goldhammer, Keith. "Implications for Administrator Training Programs." In *The Social Sciences and Educational Administration,* edited by Lawrence W. Downey and Frederick Enns. Edmonton, Canada: University of Alberta, 1963.

Davis, Donald E. "Report of Admissions Procedures and Standards for Entry into Training Programs in Educational Administration at 44 Universities." Minneapolis: Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1968.

Engleman, Finis E. "Role Descriptions and Common Elements in the Pre-Service Preparation of Principals and Superintendents." In *Preparation Programs for School Administrators: Common and Specialized Learnings,* edited by Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963.

Farquhar, Robin H. "Trends and Needs in Superintendent Preparation." *The School Administrator, (September 1969).*

———. *The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators.* Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1970.

Fogarty, Bryce M. "A Projection." Draft of chapter prepared for *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders,* edited by Jack Culbertson, Robin H. Farquhar, Bryce M. Fogarty, and Mark R. Shibles. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972 (in press).

Goldhammer, Keith. *The Social Sciences and the Preparation of Educational*

Administrators. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

———. "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the In-Service Education of the Professional Administrator." In *Continuing Education of School Administrators,* edited by Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone. Albuquerque: Department of Educational Administration, University of New Mexico, 1966.

———. "Implications for Change in Training Programs." In *Knowledge Production and Utilization in Educational Administration,* edited by Terry L. Eidell and Joanne M. Kitchel. Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

———. "The Social Sciences in Preparing Educational Leaders: An Interpretive Summary." Draft of chapter prepared for *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders,* edited by Jack Culbertson, Robin H. Farquhar, Bryce M. Fogarty, and Mark R. Shibles. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1972 (in press).

Goldhammer, Keith; Suttle, John E.; Becker, Gerald L.; and Aldridge, William D. *Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration.* Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967. 275 pages. ED 014 787 MF $0.65 HC $9.87. (Also available from Publications Department, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, $2.00.)

Gregg, Russell T. "Preparation of Administrators." Draft of article prepared for *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* 4th ed., edited by Robert L. Ebel. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1969.

Griffiths, Daniel E. *The School Superintendent.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Hall, Roy M., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. "The Student Personnel Program." In *Administrative Behavior in Education,* edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Hanson, Earl. "What Is a School Superintendent?" *Saturday Evening Post,* 234 (8 April 1961).

Harlow, James G. "Purpose-Defining: The Central Function of the School Administrator." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Hooker, Clifford P. "Developing Internship Programs in Local School Districts: Patterns for the Future." In *The Internship in Administrative Preparation,* edited by Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Horvat, John J. *Professional Negotiation in Education: A Bargaining Game with Supplementary Materials.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1967.

Howsam, Robert B. "In-Service Education of School Administrators: Background, Present Status, and Problems." In *Continuing Education of School Administrators,* edited by Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone. Albuquerque: Department of Educational Administration, University of New Mexico, 1966.

Keppel, Francis. "Public Policy in School Administration." Cambridge, Massachusetts: The New England School Development Council, 1961.

———. *The Necessary Revolution in American Education.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Knezevich, Stephen J. *The Development and Testing of a Model for a Nationally Based Vehicle Dedicated to the Continuing Professional Growth of School Administrators. Final Report.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.

Lecht, Leonard. *Goals, Priorities and Dollars: The Next Decade.* New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Lonsdale, Richard C., and McCarty, Donald J. "Learning Experiences for Tomorrow's Superintendent." In *The Internship in Administrative Preparation,* edited by Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Lortie, Dan C. "Complexity, Specialization and Professional Knowledge: Overall Strategies in the Preparation of School Administrators." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. "The Current Scene: How We Are Now Instructing Tomorrow's Educational Administrators." In *Strategies in the Preparation of School Administrators,* edited by Michael P. Thomas, Jr. Lincoln: Teachers College, University of Nebraska, National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, 1964.

———. *Selection of Administrators.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Meade, Edward J., Jr. "Expanding the Community of Education." A Ford Foundation reprint, 1967.

Miklos, Erwin R. "The Behavioral Sciences and Educational Administration: Some Reconsiderations." In *Educational Administration: International Perspectives,* edited by George Baron, Dan H. Cooper, and William G. Walker. New York: Rand-McNally & Co., 1969.

Nagle, John M. "Preparing Leaders for Education: Today and Tomorrow."

Trend, 6, 1 (Fall 1969).

Neagley, Ross L. *Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators.* New York: Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (Mid-Atlantic Region), Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

———. *Program for Full-Time Resident Students.* Philadelphia: Temple University, 1967.

New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership. *Chief School Officers: Recommendations and Report of a Survey.* Albany: 1967.

Ohm, Robert E. "A Game Model Analysis of Conflicts of Interest Situations in Administration." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 4, 3 (Autumn 1968).

Ohm, Robert E., and Monahan, William G. "Next Steps." In *Educational Administration–Philosophy in Action*, edited by Robert E. Ohm and William G. Monahan. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1965.

Ramseyer, John A. "The Internship: Some Problems and Issues." In *The Internship in Administrative Preparation*, edited by Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

———. "The Computer and Educational Administration: Some Notions and Implications." In *Computer Concepts and Educational Administration*, edited by Robert W. Marker, Peter P. McGraw, and Franklin D. Stone. Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1966.

Reller, Theodore L. "A Comprehensive Program for the Preparation of Administrators." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Rose, Gale W. "ILSA: An Individualized Learning System for Administrators." *UCEA Newsletter*, 12, 4 (July 1971).

Scott, Walter W. "Collective Negotiations: Implications for the Preparation of Administrators." In *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration*, edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Shaplin, Judson T. "The Professorship in Educational Administration: Attracting Talented Personnel." In *The Professorship in Educational Administration*, edited by Donald J. Willower and Jack Culbertson. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

Snyder, Richard C. "The Preparation of Educational Administrators: Some Problems Revisited in the Context of Establishing a New Graduate School of Administration." In *Educational Administration: International*

Perspectives, edited by George Baron, Dan H. Cooper, and William G. Walker. New York: Rand-McNally & Co., 1969.

State University of New York At Buffalo; Cornell University; University of Rochester; and Syracuse University. *A Final Report to the Ford Foundation of The Inter-University Program: Project II, The Administrative Internship Program in Education.* 1969.

Sybouts, Ward. "The Internship in Educational Administration." *The Journal of Educational Administration,* 6, 2 (October 1968).

Talbot, Allan R. "Needed: A New Breed of School Superintendent." *Harper's Magazine,* (February 1966).

Tope, Donald E.; Campbell, Robert; Dean, Howard; Foskett, John M.; Fosmire, Fred; and Littman, Richard A. *The Social Sciences View School Administration.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

University Council for Educational Administration. "Improving Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States: Some Action Guides." Unpublished document prepared for distribution to UCEA member universities. Columbus, Ohio: Committee on Guides for Improving Preparatory Programs, 1962.

———. "Long-Range Goals." Paper prepared by Central Staff for a conference sponsored by the Ford Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

———. "Professors." Paper prepared by Central Staff for a conference sponsored by the Ford Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

———. *The Selective Recruitment of Educational Leaders.* Columbus, Ohio: Central Staff, 1966.

———. *"Toward the Development of a 1969-1974 UCEA Plan for Advancing Educational Administration."* Unpublished planning document. Columbus, Ohio: Central Staff, 1967.

Uzmack, Joseph H., Jr. "High School Students' Perceptions of the Chief School Administrator." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

Walton, John. "The Education of Educational Administrators." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Willis, Benjamin C. "Continuing Education for Present Administrators." In *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* edited by Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.